

Chiefly sorry my lectures were brought to so sudden a termination because it is tiresome for you as well as for me to have to go over the same ground again. But at least I hope it will be unnecessary to go closely into detail, and those of you who have the vigour for it can very well fill in the outline I give you by referring to (your old notes) the director's invaluable Dictionary, or to the standard Musical Histories; none of which of course can be described as even moderately trustworthy on the whole, but by checking one against another you may get something near the truth. Now there are all sorts of ways of looking at history, and each in its several way(s) may be of service to humanity ~~of you and to make it of any use to yourselves, you surely(?) ought to study it as a means to the better filling of your xxx xxx in the art of Music and the xxx range (?) of Music. The reason why so many~~

Even that trivial type of Art Archeologist whose one object it is to accumulate details that have escaped other people's notice occasionally stumbles across a fact which will be of use to people who take an intelligent view of history, though it is generally of no use to himself but may increase his own conceit (?). Then there is the type who go to history with a preconceived idea of what it ought to be and with the view of obtaining your sympathy. These gentlemen generally have a following of the type of limp (?) creature with a tendency to enthuse! Who are caught by every breath of what looks like ideal, and go about the world preaching preposterous absurdities under the impression that they are poetical. But, you I hope will take it up with a better idea of what is worth getting out of it. And I may suggest to you one or two ways in which it is useful.

[Blank page]

The reason why many people's sympathies with different styles of Music is so limited is that they don't see what the composer – in a style they are unfamiliar with— is driving at. They don't discover what he is trying to do. They have not got hold of the key that will unlock the door and a mass of beautiful things ~~falls upon deaf ears~~ is hidden from them till they can find it. But it is worthwhile to take even more than a little trouble ~~worth looking~~ to enlarge the range of your higher enjoyments. ~~By adding~~ To add new fields such as will ~~which~~ minister to the enjoyment of even the familiar branches of art by giving you something to dwell upon which is in a marked contrast to your everyday Music. If you can enjoy many different kinds of art you are less likely to get jaded in the particular line to which you have to devote the greater part of your energies. One of the most serious dangers to a professional musician is to get into ruts, and to do their artistic work mechanically and without heart and emotional spirit. No doubt you young people in your present state of ready enthusiasm

[Blank page]

can hardly realise that it is ever possible to look upon your lot (?) as a professional business. It seems to be full of endless varieties ~~possibilities~~ of new engagements, that you didn't fear the possibility of pursuing professional duties making it a drudgery. It is as well you don't, and only wish you never might. But of one thing I am sure, that the wider your sympathies are the more likelihood there is that you will keep your enjoyment of your art fresh and unwearied. I have often had occasion to notice what a pull a little knowledge over and beyond a man's particular line in art gives him. It is not mere thinking on my part. It may seem a paradox, but a pianist who can enjoy his old English Madrigals will play the music which is his own particular business better whether it be Chopin or Brahms or Schumann. And a violinist will undoubtedly play his Sonatas and Concertos better and with a ~~wide~~ wider

How often are we exasperated by the case (?) hardened vanity of some secondrate performer or composer; whose achievements are as childish as his belief in this is colossal. Such vanity generally comes from either ignorance of the incapacity to see the abilities of the people through perennial(?) isolation, or limited opportunities of mixing with the people. The case is parallel and only different in degree to those who only know their own department and their own time, and are self satisfied because they don't understand the achievements of other times.

*I am not in favour of that kind of tasteless cosmopolitanism that swallows everything that comes along with indiscriminate relish – that is equally enthralled and intoxicated with The Huguenots or Fidelio and there too a knowledge of Tristan(?) may save you. You can listen, even to bad music with intelligence at least. But if you are not wounded by its falseness you may study the manner in which tricks of style are used effectively to catch the vulgar. You may watch with amusement the half sincere self complacency(?) of the charlatan posing as prophet.

range of influence upon his auditors if his sympathies can take in the early Italian Cantatas and the finest achievements of Josquin and Palestrina, and understand something of the way in which the organisation of technique of art can be what it is. Of all the things, ~~history~~ the study of history helps human beings to a wider and liberal mind, to a generous way of regarding things which conduces to a man's own happiness as well as to his charity to his fellow men, a thing of all others which every man should strive for this among the best and most precious things attainable. The extreme (?), prejudiced being is always a bane to himself and his fellows in large walks of life, but he is almost worst of all in Art – whereas to the widely liberal mind even the most insane(?) vulgarities may have some interesting qualities. And the most meretricious flummery of as in eating false types of music may nevertheless have some qualities from which even a Beethoven might learn something if he thought it worth his while. But in such case it is as well to walk warily with eyes open.* It is one of the most hopeful signs of our times that people begin to take wider interest in different types of Music. I remember the day when a very prominent

[Blank page]

English Musician poured contempt publicly upon the barbarous old music of the Madrigal kind. But of late years we have seen the very mixed audiences of a provincial Festival listen with intent to the prolonged archaic simplicity of Schütz

Lamentations of David for the death of Absalom; and twice have I heard the great Stabat Mater of Palestrina in like circumstances. A work almost entirely devoid of any quality which the mob of modern musical amateurism holds dear. This is quite as it should be. And assuredly ~~young~~ people who mean to make music a very prominent element in their life(?) should take every opportunity to be level with the best tendencies of the age; and be able at least to put the more important features in the story of music in their proper places, and understand the relations in which they stand to each other. It would be indeed a shame to a musician in these days not to understand in what sort of relation Lasso and Palestrina stood to

Justly in these days we want some anchor to hold by. The democracy (which very much includes the so called upper classes) is in such a hurry to get its enjoyment pleasure quota(?) and go into fresh ones without trouble it is hard not to be swept away into a vortex of trumpery triviality and not to get persuaded that the other qualities of art are rather superfluous; and that a skillfully creative amusement is quite as worthy of human consideration as a great artistic achievement – democracy which has taken years to complete has lost hold of its bearings. There is no sense of adequate relation. Attempt is made to regulate the proceedings at a popular place of amusement and the newspapers have not xxx? but whole shouts of wild hysterics of extravagant fury as if the habeas corpus act had been suspended or the British Commander in Chief had betrayed the whole British Army into the hands of the nearest French Field Marshall. Democracy is all abroad(?). They expend columns of large print upon a book about partridge shooting, or mention the death of the greatest scientist or philosopher of the age with an inaccurate short biography in small type. VS

Monteverde and Carissimi; how Bach's particular method of writing for the organ or for voices came to be what they are; what were the sources of Handel's style and some of the works that go by his name and what fully constitutes the prominent greatness of Mozart Haydn or Beethoven, and what sort of connection or contrast there is between Gluck and Wagner. These are things which it would be a scandal for anyone calling himself a musician not to know. Of course there are preliminaries which require more patience. We must go a good way back behind Palestrina to see which processes brought about the particular kind of organisation of musical material which enabled him to achieve his triumph – and if the consideration of details which have no musical significance is liable to the dry and wearisome, still it is ~~something~~ interesting to consider the excessive scantiness of musical resources a thousand years ago if only to

We want something to give us firm ground for our opinions of the worth of the worthiest things in Art. We want something to give us assurance that the difference of our opinions from the groundlings to the gallery have some justification. For in my opinion justification is much better than the most obstinate dogmatism.

throw light upon the wonderful amount of development that mankind has been able to achieve upon so exceedingly slender a basis. We can almost trace every step in the gradual development and organisation of material from the crude plainsong and descant of the early mediaeval church up to the present day. We can see men proceeding from helpless blundering in two and three parts at a time to the singularly perfect vocal writing of the 16th and 17th centuries. We can watch the emergence of a distinct instrumental style, the contrivance(?) of an intelligible basis of abstract instrumental music – the transition from abstract to cultural and dramatic music all going on steadily step by step till you arrive at the fantastic scenes and pictures of Berlioz, the colossal proportions of the Wagner ~~Opera~~ Music Drama, and the passionate and sensuous emotionalism of Tschaikowski's big symphony vi, and the mature intellectualism and suggestiveness of Brahms's instrumental music.

[Parry notates the first two lines of 'Rule Britannia' in neume form]

Contrast with such a state of artistic organisation the state of art before the year 1000 AD. It had hardly developed any plan even for writing down a simple line of melody. The best they had were the neumes which were simply marks of various shapes put at various heights over the words to be sung and indicating roughly the relation of pitches of the notes to be sung. But so indefinite were they that it was obviously necessary to learn by ear what you had to sing and merely(?) to look at the neumes to assist your memory. But wildly crude as these neumes were they were ~~developed~~ the ultimate sources of our present system of notation. The first step was to draw a line through ~~the~~ such ~~some~~ of the neumes as happened to be of the same pitch and they found at least that one note. And then one went on to draw other lines at definite distances from the first to represent other pitches and so by degrees our stave was formed. But even when they had got so far as that they still had

Length of notes.

nothing to help them to know how long to hold a note or quickly to pass over an unimportant one. And it was not till some hundreds of years after the theses of the early days began to be discussed by theorists that any mention was made of methods of identifying a difference such as between a minim and a quaver, or a semibreve and a semiquaver. When music was purely melodic of course it was of no very great importance to settle the relative length of notes. You have of course noticed frequently at convivial meetings of rustics and harvest homes or parish cricket dinners or lent(?) audits(?) that the popular solo singer does not observe any rules of exact rhythm which imply any knowledge of minims and crotchets or time signatures, and so it was in the times long ago. In the picturesque days of Charlemagne and King Alfred and the Venerable Bede and Saxon Harold and Norman William they could dispense with note values because

[Blank page]

they sang not in parts. And even when they did begin to sing in parts as the parts consisted chiefly in successions of 4^{ths} and 5^{ths} it was only a simultaneous progression of similar melodies and required but very little adjustment of one voice to another. But when the system began to be imposed upon by some little independence of the voice parts it soon became indispensable to know how long the bass was to hold a C or a D while the tenor or descant got through a passage of several notes and so came into use of the system called Cantus Mensurabilis, of which the first recognised treatise is the theorist Franco of Cologne and was probably written about the middle of the 12th century. In this the notes to be used are classified as the large(?) (example) the long (example) the breve, or short (example) and the semibreve (or half-short)(example). I daresay many of you have noticed in the course of your educational experience that theorists have a great gift for making

[Blank page]

things unintelligible even in modern times. What the mediaeval science(?) of music had to go through is piteous to think of in every department of this science. These notes had no measurable final relation to one another but varied with a time signature put at the beginning of the music. The time which was held in most respects, was a triple time in the see p.20

[Parry's introductory notes (MS4312a) end abruptly here. Loose leaf pages of notes follow (MS 4312 3/3, MS 4312 2/3) and then MS 4312 proper begins]

[Blank page]

[Blank page]

[Blank page]